



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

GRAECO-ROMAN JUDAICA

Jüdisch-Christlicher Schulbetrieb in Alexandria und Rom.

Literarische Untersuchungen zu Philo und Clemens von Alexandria, Justin und Irenäus. Von W. BOUSSET. [*Forschungen zur Rel. u. Lit. des A. u. N. Testaments*, Neue Folge, Heft 6, her. von H. GUNKEL u. W. BOUSSET.] Göttingen, VANDENHOECK und RUPRECHT, 1915. pp. viii, 319.

THE main title of the book is ambiguous. 'Schule' in this case denotes 'Academy', and an approximate translation would perhaps be, 'Scholastic Tradition among the Jews and Christians of Alexandria'. Rome, it may be noted, is referred to only in the last few pages.

Essentially the book is one of the many *Quellenstudien* which have loomed so largely in the German scholarship of the last decades. Professor Bousset undertakes to show in extant works of Philo and Clement that a large part of the material is taken almost bodily from other sources and is therefore not the product of the independent thinking of these men. But, whereas in other investigations of this sort it is attempted to show that the material so 'conveyed' is incorporated into the body of the work, because the author desired to appropriate it, it is argued here that the borrowed matter is not so incorporated, that Philo and Clement, in a sense, did not appropriate it at all, but on the contrary would have vigorously opposed it, if they had met it in controversial form. Why, then, was it introduced? Simply, declares Bousset, because it represented the scholastic tradition of the actual schools in which Philo and Clement received their training and because they had for that tradition an unbounded reverence.

As far as Philo is concerned, Bousset is concededly developing

suggestions contained in Bréhier's excellent treatise, *Les Idées philosophiques et religieuses de Philon d'Alexandrie* (Paris, 1908).

He analyses closely *Leg. Alleg. I-III, De Ebrietate and De Congressu Eruditionis Gratia* (pp. 43-101). It is in these that he regards his contention as demonstrated with particular clearness (p. 153). He finds especially in the allegorical commentary, doctrines that are principally derived from the later Stoa, that deal with biblical matters in a purely intellectual manner, and are based on a philosophic sensualism. All this is quite at variance with Philo's general moral and homiletic purpose and is manifestly opposed to his fundamental dogma of the impotence of the unaided human reason.

Bousset's method is the familiar one of noting contrasts of terminology between different parts of the book, of emphasizing the absence of qualifying statements, and of setting forth apparent contradictions or contradictory implications.

What was the nature of the scholastic tradition so freely used by Philo? While of Hellenic origin—Stoic, Neo-pythagorean, Epicurean—it was derived immediately from Jewish sources. It represented the teaching of the Alexandrian Jewish academies where Philo was trained and was characterized by a moral and religious indifferentism. Philo may have had the material before him in the form of actual note-books or in the lecture-sheets prepared by successive teachers for class-room use but not for publication. Bousset obtains these suggestions from W. Jäger, *Studien zur Entwicklungsgeschichte der Metaphysik des Aristoteles* (1912), and Gronau, *Poseidonius und die jüdisch-christliche Genesis-exegese* (1914).

For readers of the *JQR*, the existence of such a school cannot but be of the highest interest. Philo unquestionably is fond of quoting authorities anonymously, οἱ φυσικοί, οἱ φυσιολογούντες, or more generally οἱ μὲν, οἱ δέ (*De leg. spec.* 5, 208). These anonymous authorities seem clearly enough, as Bousset and Bréhier contend, to derive from the later Stoa, but the essential point of Bousset's argument is that they come to Philo through Jewish mediation, to wit, that of an actual academic tradition.

That certain Greek philosophic concepts were commonly used in Jewish schools in Alexandria admits of little doubt. In *d. rer. div. haer.* 280, in the phrase of Gen. 15. 15 *σὺ δὲ ἀπελεύσῃ πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας*, the statement is made by Philo that some (*ἐνιοὶ*) take the 'fathers' to be the sun and moon, some understand the *ἀρχέτυποι ἰδέαι*, some the four primal elements. Philo states these three views without indicating a preference,—a practice rare enough in Greek writers but common in the Mishnah. Accordingly, we have here, in a discussion of biblical exegesis, the application of Greek philosophic concepts, so that this single passage would of itself give probability to Bousset's principal thesis.

Just how far he has established his contention in any given case, i. e. just how fully he has demonstrated the Greek source and the Jewish mediation of the passages he brackets as un-Philonic, will be variously decided. The arguments in the main are cumulative, so that an attack on any one point will not be a conclusive answer. If Bousset were better acquainted with Rabbinic literature, he would find the procedure of Philo in citing matter opposed to his own views, without refuting it, not quite so strange.

Legitimate question may be raised on another point, and that is how Bousset reconciles the argument of the entire work with the statement of the preface (p. 1) that 'the philosophic literature—properly so-called—of the Jews arose in the time of Philo and primarily through his labours'.

The second part of the book (pp. 155-319) is devoted to Clement and the two other Church Fathers mentioned in the sub-title. Just as Bousset followed the suggestions of Bréhier in dealing with Philo, in his treatment of Clement he bases his work on the researches of Collomp, *Une Source de Clément d'Alexandrie et des Homélies Pseudo-Clémentines* (*Rev. de Phil. et Litt. et d'Hist. Anc.*, vol. 37 (1913), pp. 19-46). Collomp, and Bousset in this book, find in the *Excerpta ex Theodoto*, the *Eclogues* and *Strom.* VI-VII, a complete dependence on, almost a verbal citation of, Clement's teacher, Pantainos, the head of the

school where the Alexandrian catechumens were trained (cf. Eus. *Hist. Eccl.* V, 10, 1). Pantainos, however, and his school leaned toward Gnosticism in its more mystical and oriental forms, which as a rule, Clement opposed. In the case of Clement, the admission of such great blocks of matter, quite opposed to his own teaching, is explained by the reverential attitude Clement had toward this school, for which we have his own testimony (*Strom.* I, 11, 1).

The chapters on Justin and Irenaeus are merely applications of the same doctrine.

It is a highly stimulating and valuable work that the well-known Göttingen scholar here presents, and one that repays careful examination, whether his conclusions are accepted or not.

Studien zur Byzantinisch-jüdischen Geschichte. Von Prof. Dr. SAMUEL KRAUSS. (XXI. Jahresbericht der Israelitisch-Theologischen Lehranstalt in Wien für das Schuljahr 1913-1914.) Wien, 1914. pp. 160.

Professor Krauss's study is divided into five sections. Section I deals with the external history of the Jews in the Eastern Roman Empire from 476 C. E. till about the middle of the thirteenth century (pp. 1-55). Section II treats of their social position (pp. 55-77). Section III with their organization and distribution (pp. 77-99). Sections IV and V contain a miscellaneous group of topics: Byzantium in Jewish Literature, Byzantine cultural elements and Byzantine Greek in Jewish writings and liturgy, Jewish scholars in the Empire, Lists of Emperors in Jewish writings, Jewish references to Byzantine wars, and finally a discussion of Schechter's article on the Chazars (*JQR.*, N.S., III, 204 ff.).

The history of the Jews in the Eastern Roman Empire is a field that has been most undeservedly neglected. If it is remembered that for mediaeval Europe that Empire was, in a very real sense, the centre of civilization, the importance of the Jewish communities there can scarcely be overrated. Professor

Krauss has put together data of a most interesting kind from both Jewish and Byzantine sources. Perhaps the most important sections are the second and third, in which the social life of the Jews is described. Much of this information is found only in scattered periodicals and its collection here renders it conveniently accessible for the first time.

Unfortunately the value of the work is marred by the defects that so often characterize the author's method. In spite of his unquestionably broad scholarship, Professor Krauss only too often allows himself to be led into a recklessness of statement that makes it impossible to accept his conclusions on many matters without renewed examination. In most cases that is due to haste in composition. So in discussing the celebrated Novel of Justinian (Nov. 146) the phrase *διὰ τὸ μάλιστα περὶ τὴν ἐρμηνείαν συμβεβηκός* merely means 'particularly because of what happened when the translation (viz. of the LXX) was made', and contains nothing unintelligible (p. 58, n. 5). Similarly *κατὰ δύο* (*in binos*) means 'in groups of two', not, 'in two parts'. Similarly, from his description of the Basilica (p. 62) nobody could learn the fact that this code is merely an abridgement of Justinian's *Corpus* in sixty (not eighty) books. But a specially flagrant example of the author's carelessness occurs in his discussion of the Chazar-document discovered by Schechter (p. 154, n. 1). Commenting on the word *בּוֹלְשָׁי*, Krauss says, 'Das ist kein Eigennamen, sondern Titel, ein Würdenträger mit dem Titel *καρχᾶς*, Constant. Porphyrog. c. 40 (citirt in *A Magyar Nemzet története*, I, 47), griechisch *Βουλσσάζης* geschrieben.' Now if Professor Krauss had consulted the actual words of Constantine as they appear in the Bonn Corpus, and not in a Hungarian translation, he would have read *De ad. imp.* 40 (Const. Por. iii, 175, l. 12) *μετὰ τοῦ Βουλτζοῦ, τοῦ τρίτου ἀρχοντος καὶ καρχᾶ Τουρκίας*. And later *ὁ Βουλτζοὺς ὁ καρχᾶς υἱὸς ἐστὶ τοῦ Καλῆ τοῦ καρχᾶ*. The word *בּוֹלְשָׁי*, therefore, is, as the obvious sense of the passage demands, a name and not a title, and its evident correspondence to the name *Βουλτζοὺς* is additional and welcome evidence of how authentic the sources of Schechter's document were.

However, in spite of these defects, Krauss has put scholars under obligation to him, and it is to be hoped that further researches will be made in this field.

Syria as a Roman Province. By E. S. BOUCHIER. Oxford : B. H. BLACKWELL ; New York : LONGMANS, GREEN, & Co., 1916. pp. vi, 304.

After a survey of the ethnography and geography of Syria, Bouchier gives us in Chapters II, IV, VI, VIII, a brief history of Syria from Seleucid days to the Arab conquest. A complete chapter (IV) is devoted to the Syrian imperial dynasty, and almost another (VI) to Palmyra. Interspersed among them, are accounts of Antioch (III), and other cities of Syria (V), and a discussion of the country's produce and the dispersion of its people (VII). Finally, chapters IX–XII deal with Literature, Religion, Architecture and the Arts. A short bibliography and a full index add appreciably to the book's value.

Mr. Bouchier professes to make no original contribution either in presentation or point of view. He has given a readable and interesting account of the external and internal fortunes of an important section and an important time. His command of the sources is adequate. It may be said that no circumstance of moment has been altogether omitted, and the general reader—for whom the book is intended—will obtain a clear and full conception of what Syria and Syrians meant to the history of Rome. That fact is one of the principal claims of the book upon the general public. Recent investigations, such as those of Strzygowski in the field of art, and Cumont in the history of religion, have made it clear that throughout the Empire it is in the East that the economic and cultural centre of gravity—and soon the political as well—is to be sought. But these views, generally accepted among scholars, have not filtered into current hand-books as yet, and the traditional presentation which almost ignores the East is the one still commonly used, so that, for many such a book as Bouchier's will supply a needful corrective

Especially in its account of Syrian emigration, will it prove of value. The ordinary reader finds it difficult to realize the enormous range of the dispersion of Syrians and Syrian ideas, and the details furnished, pp. 171-9, ought to set right many common misconceptions.

There is more than one matter which might be questioned. So, in discussing the Roman attitude toward Syrians, it would have been well to stress the vague character of the term *Syrus* at all stages of its use. Again, Gabinius was so little the enemy of the Jews which he appears to be in pp. 26-7, that we have the famous statement of Cicero that he outrageously favoured them. On p. 50, we have repeated the traditional account of the Hadrianic rebellion, which rests on insecure footing. On p. 101, we might have been told of Elagabalus's attempt at the fusion of existing faiths, a movement more directly undertaken by his cousin Alexander. Again, it is a wholly misleading statement that occurs on p. 116: 'Thus the exclusive Roman law in the commentaries which they (viz. Ulpian, Papinian, and Gaius) published became considerably modified by the cosmopolitan principle of the *ius gentium*.' What Ulpian and Papinian brought to the Roman law was rather the systematizing influence of science and philosophy, which was an imperative necessity for such a code of empiric precedents as the Roman system had become. In discussing the various cities of Syria, pp. 112-89, it would have been serviceable to mention the political status of most of them as set forth by Ulpian, *Dig.* l. 15. 1; e.g. that Tyre and Heliopolis and other cities, as well as Berytus, possessed the *ius Italicum* in most cases conferred by Septimius Severus. Further, in any biography, no matter how small, there should be a reference to Mommsen on the Roman Provinces (*R. G.*, vol. 5).

In general it may be said that the book has a somewhat amateurish tone. Scholars will profit little by it. But it more than compensates for that by the vividness of its style and the interesting character of the information here made accessible. Such pictures as Bouchier gives of Syrian student-life, p. 117 ff. and 222 ff., of the romantic movement that resulted in some of

the most important Greek romances, the parent of modern fiction (p. 231 ff.), are not only well done in themselves but present details not easily found elsewhere. All this cannot but serve to give a real content to the readers' conception of the time and the place.

Studies in the History of the Roman Province of Syria. By GUSTAVE ADOLPHUS HARRER. Princeton: PRINCETON UNIVERSITY PRESS, 1915. pp. 94.

In this Princeton dissertation, Dr. Harrer has prepared a Prosopographia of the governors of Syria from the time of the great revolt in 68 to about the time of Diocletian. There are added appendices on The Separation of Syria and Cilicia, The Revolt of Pescennius Niger and The Divisions of Syria.

The work is one of painstaking and accurate scholarship, and is invaluable for chronological purposes. One cannot, however, help wondering whether doctoral dissertations ought not to be directed to a less arid field. Except as an exercise in the use of the sources, there is practically no opportunity for the application of critical judgement.

The governor whom the author calls 'unknown' (p. 28), he later identifies—with reservations—as Arrian, the historiographer, *Class. Phil.*, 11 (1916), 339.

New York.

MAX RADIN.